



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/749,967	12/28/2000	Larry D. Woodring	BELL-0026/99190	6937

7590

08/21/2003

John E. McGlynn  
Woodcock Washburn Kurtz  
Mackiewicz & Norris LLP  
One Liberty Place - 46th Floor  
Philadelphia, PA 19103

EXAMINER

BARNIE, REXFORD N

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2643

DATE MAILED: 08/21/2003

5

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.  
09/749,967

Applicant(s)  
LARRY WOODRING

Examiner  
REXFORD BARNIE

Art Unit  
2643



-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on Dec 28, 2000.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above, claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claims \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.  
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some\* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\*See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

- 14) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

- 15) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). 4 6) ☐ Other:

*R. V. Barnie*  
REXFORD BARNIE  
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Art Unit: 2643

**DETAILED ACTION**

***Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103***

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-9, 12, 13, 15-20 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kay et al. (US Pat# 5,247,571) in view of kay (US Pat# 5,729,598).

Regarding claims 1 and 12, Kay teaches a system for managing calls within a telephone network comprising of a plurality of SSP to which caller calling a business can be connected as well as an agent working on behalf of a business in (see fig. 1). Kay teaches a SCP which can keep records of work at home agent information, billing information and routing data in (see col. 18 line 41-col .19). Furthermore, assuming a caller is connected to a SSP associated with a business, the call is intercepted at the SSP and then the SCP is queried for call routing information at which point, the call can be forwarded to an agent working at home by using known call forwarding techniques in (see col. 19). When a call is made by an agent working at home on behalf of a business, it is noted and then billed to the business according to Kay. Kay fails to teach in detail the possibility of just using ANI to determine whether a call is to be billed as a work at home call.

Art Unit: 2643

Kay ' 598 teaches a telephone network with telecommuting features wherein an agent can work on behalf of an organization at home. The work at home feature can be triggered by simply using ANI in (see col. 5). Furthermore, (see col. 16 lines 2-15), a large corporations can be billed for calls made from one's residence.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Kay into that of kay thus making it possible to bill calls made on behalf of a corporation to the corporation in order to encourage telecommuting, a current incentive being offered by many business.

Regarding claims 2-9, The combination teaches being able to route calls to or forward them to an agent at home using known call forwarding techniques and if a call is made by an agent on behalf of a business/corporation, billing the business entity for the call based on information stored in a database of a SCP.

Regarding claims 13 and 22, see the explanation as set forth in the rejection of claim 1 in addition to the fact that system would perform the method steps.

Regarding claims 15-16, The combination teaches being able to forward calls to an agent working on behalf of an organization using known techniques.

Regarding claims 17-20, The combination teaches being able to route calls to or forward them to an agent at home using known call forwarding techniques and if a call is made by an agent on behalf of a business/corporation, billing the business entity for the call based on information stored in a database of a SCP.

Art Unit: 2643

3. Claims 10, 11, 14 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kay et al. (US Pat# 5,247,571) in view of kay (US Pat# 5,729,598) and further in view of Shaffer et al.. (US Pat# 6,252,953).

Regarding claims 10, 11, 14 and 21, The combination fails to teach the claimed subject matter but distinctive ringing is notoriously well known in the art. Shaffer et al. teaches a work at home system wherein features such as call forwarding and distinctive ringing can be used in (see col. 5 lines 23-33).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Shaffer into that of the combination thus making it possible to alert a called party of the fact that an incoming call may be urgent which is an advantage associated with distinctive ringing.

#### ***Conclusion***

4. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communication from the examiner should be directed to REXFORD BARNIE whose telephone number is (703) 306-2744. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:30 to 6:00p.m. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Curtis Kuntz, can be reached on (703) 305-4708.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

· Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks  
Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to (703) 872-9314 and labeled accordingly (Please label **"PROPOSED/INFORMAL" or "FORMAL"**).

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA., Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 306-0377.

Application/Control Number: 09/749,967

Page 5

Art Unit: 2643

Rexford Barnie  
Patent Examiner  
08/17/03

*RBarnie*  
**REXFORD BARNIE**  
**PRIMARY EXAMINER**